

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration, reexamination, and allowance of the present patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants appreciate the indication by the Examiner that claims 1-4, 7-13, 15-17, 20-22 and 25 are allowed.

Summary of Office Action

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,048,412 to Martin *et al.* (US'412) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,928,214 to Oyama (US'214).

The Office Action also rejects claims 6 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US'412 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,890,794 to Abtahi *et al.* (US'794).

The Office Action also rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US'412 in view of US'214 as applied to claim 5, and further in view of US'794.

The Office Action further rejects claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US'412 in view of US'214 as applied to claim 5, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,654,629 to Bezos *et al.* (US'629).

The Office Action also rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US'412 in view of US'794 as applied to claim 6, and further in view of US'629.

The Office Action also rejects claims 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US'412 (Figs. 8A, 8B, 19A-19D) in view of US'412 (Fig. 1C) ("Martin PRIOR ART").

The Office Action also indicates that claims 1-4, 7-13, 15-17, 20-22 and 25 are allowed.

Summary of Response to Office Action

In Response to Office Action, Applicant hereby amends claims 5, 6, 12, 20-26 and 28. Claims 1-30 are pending and claims 1, 5, 6, 26 and 28 are the pending independent claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US'412 in view of US'214. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

US'412 discloses an axial LED source lamp having LED light sources that are placed about the lamp axis in a parallel/axial arrangement. The lamp includes a post with post facets where LED sources are mounted. The lamp axis according to US'412 is along the direction of light emission.

US'214 discloses a vehicular front lamp that includes a light source 2, a reflector 3 and a lens 4. The reflector 3 includes an upper curved surface 31 arranged at a higher position than the light source 2 and a lower curved surface 32 arranged at a lower position than the light source 2. The upper and lower first curved surfaces 31 and 32 reflect light from the light source 2 in the right and left directions, respectively. US'214 also discloses an opaque mask 202 mounted near a focal point F3 of a convex lens lens 201 (Fig. 7). The Office Action alleges that US'214 discloses a shade located in a lateral direction from the light source holder and in a direction substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the light holder.

However, neither US'412 nor US'214 discloses a shade having a longitudinal axis and the longitudinal axis forming an angle greater than 0° with respect to the optical axis of the lamp, as recited in claim 5. In contrast, US'214 merely discloses a light shielding unit adjacent a light source.

Therefore, the combination of US'412 and US'214 fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as recited in claim 5. Furthermore, not only would it not have been obvious to modify and combine US'412 and US'214 to arrive at the invention recited in claim 5, such a combination would be contrary to the teachings of US'412. US'412 relates to an axial LED source and its configuration relates to the light emissions from an LED device. US'214 relates to a traditional metal halide type lamp or a halogen type lamp which has different light emission characteristics, including orientation, than an LED lamp. Therefore, US'412 and

US'214 are incompatible for combination at least for the purpose of arriving at Applicant's claimed invention.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested. Furthermore, withdrawal of the rejection of dependant claim 23 is respectfully requested in view of the points discussed above and for the additional features which claim 23 recites.

The Office Action rejects claims 6 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over US'412 in view of US'794. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, US'412 discloses an axial LED source lamp having LED light sources that are placed about the lamp axis in a parallel/axial arrangement. US '794 is directed to a lighting unit that includes a circuit board having a number of LED packages extending outward from a front side. The printed circuit board is covered by a transparent cover forming an outer cavity between the cover and the printed circuit board.

The Office Action asserts that US'794 "discloses at least one of the LED arrays including a cylindrical lens (abstract, Fig. 5 on the outside) having a longitudinal axis in a row direction of the at least one LED arrays (Fig. 5)." However, as described in the specification of US'794, only a transparent cover 64 is disclosed. The transparent cover 64 is the outer cover of the device and may accumulate moisture due to climatic conditions. This moisture can alter the optical properties of the inner surface 84 of the transparent cover 64.

Thus, the combination of US'412 and US'794 fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of a cylindrical lens formed over at least one of the at least one LED array, the cylindrical lens changing an emission angle of light emitted from the at least one LED array to be one of a wider angle and a narrower angle, and the cylindrical lens having a longitudinal axis that substantially coincides with said row axis of the at least one LED array, as recited in claim 6. US'794 merely provides a transparent cover 64. Therefore, the combination of US'412 and US'794 fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as recited in claim 6. Furthermore, it would not have been obvious to modify and combine US'412 and US'794 to arrive at the invention claimed in claim 6. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully

requested. Furthermore, withdrawal of the rejection of dependant claim 24 is respectfully requested in view of the points discussed above and for the additional features which claim 24 recites.

The Office Action also rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over US'412 in view of US'214 in further view of US'794. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 depends from claim 5. As described above, the combination of US'412 and US'214 fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as recited in claim 5. Furthermore, US'794 fails to supply the deficiencies of US'412 and US'214. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of US'412, US'214 and US'794 fails to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as recited in claim 14 for the reasons described above and for the additional features which claim 14 recites. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over US'412 in view of US'214 in further view of US'629. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 depends from claim 5. As described above, the combination of US'412 and US'214 fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as recited in claim 5. US'629 discloses a vehicle marker light in which LEDs 12 are arranged to face in the direction of a lens 33. Control circuitry energizes the LEDs 12 at predetermined or variable flashing rates. Therefore, US'629 fails to supply the deficiencies of US'412 and US'214. As a result, the combination of US'412, US'214 and US'694 fails to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as recited in dependant claim 18. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over US'412 in view of US'794 in further view of US'629. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 19 depends from claim 6. As described above, the combination of US'412 and US'794 fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as recited in claim 6. Furthermore, US'629 fails to supply the deficiencies of US'412 and US'794. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of US'412, US'794 and US'629 fails to teach or suggest

Applicants' invention as recited in claim 19 for the reasons described above and for the additional features which claim 19 recites. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action also rejects claims 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. as being unpatentable over US'412 in view of Martin PRIOR ART (Fig. 1C of Martin US'412). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, US'412 discloses an axial LED source lamp having LED light sources that are placed about the lamp axis in a parallel/axial arrangement. The lamp includes a post with post facets where LED sources are mounted. The lamp axis according to US'412 is along the direction of light emission.

Martin PRIOR ART discloses a lamp having an array of individual LEDs which are located in a plane normal to a lamp axis in a trans-axial arrangement. As shown in Fig. 1C of Martin, only a row of LEDs disposed about an apex of a reflector, and emitting light to an aperture of the reflector is disclosed.

Therefore, the combination of US'412 and Martin PRIOR ART fails to teach or suggest that at least one row of LED chips extends substantially perpendicular to an optical axis of the LED type lamp, and wherein light emitted from the at least three LED arrays is emitted along a direction substantially perpendicular to the optical axis of the LED type lamp, as recited in claim 26. Furthermore, it would not have been obvious to modify the combination of US'412 and Martin PRIOR ART to arrive at Applicants' invention as recited in claim 26.

In addition, the combination of US'412 and Martin PRIOR ART fails to teach or suggest that at least one row of LED chips is arranged substantially perpendicular to the optical axis and wherein light emitted from the at least one row of LED chips is substantially perpendicular to the optical axis of the LED type lamp, as recited in claim 28. Furthermore, it would not have been obvious to modify the combination of US'412 and Martin PRIOR ART to arrive at Applicants' invention as recited in claim 28.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C §103 is respectfully requested. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependant claims 27, 29 and 30 under 35

U.S.C §103 is respectfully requested for the reasons related to their respective base claims 26 and 28 as described above and for the additional features which those claims recite.

With respect to the Statement of Reasons for Allowance included with the May 21, 2007 Office Action, Applicant has the following comments. While the claimed combinations are patentable over the art for the reasons presented therein, the claimed combinations are patentable for many different and/or additional reasons. More specifically, the patentability of the claimed combinations is not limited to (nor necessarily relies on) the particular subset of features identified in the Statement, but rather it is the entire combination of elements and features, each taken as a whole, that are patentable over the art, both taken alone and in hypothetical combination.

Conclusion


Applicant respectfully submits that the present patent application is in condition for allowance in its entirety. An early indication of the allowability of this patent application is therefore respectfully solicited.

If the Patent Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the undersigned would expedite passage of this patent application to issue, she is invited to call on the number below.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. If, however, additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees

necessitated by this paper, and to credit all refunds and overpayments, to our Deposit Account listed on the application transmittal filed with this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Cermak Kenealy & Vaidya LLP

By:  /djk/
Ajit J. Vaidya
Reg. No. 43,214

David J. Kenealy
Reg. No. 40,411

U.S.P.T.O. Customer Number 39083
Cermak Kenealy & Vaidya LLP
515 E. Braddock Rd., Suite B
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
703.778.3584 (v)
703.652.5101 (f)

Date: November 21, 2007